United Nations A/C.1/49/PV.14

General Assembly

Official Records

First Committee

14th Meeting

Monday, 7 November 1994, 3 p.m.

New York

Chairman: Mr. Valencia Rodriguez . . . . . (Ecuador)

The meeting was called to order at 3.25 p.m.

Agenda items 53-66, 68-72 and 153 (*continued*)

Consideration of draft resolutions submitted under all disarmament and international security agenda items

The Chairman (*interpretation from Spanish*): I call on the representative of Sri Lanka, who will introduce draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.37, entitled "Implementation of the declaration of the Indian Ocean as a zone of peace".

Mr. Kalpagé (Sri Lanka), Chairman of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean: I have the honour to present the report of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean, document A/49/29. The report was adopted by consensus in the Ad Hoc Committee. As members of the First Committee will recall, the Ad Hoc Committee was established in 1972 to realize the goals set out in the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace, General Assembly resolution 2832 (XXVI), adopted in December 1971.

The objectives of the Ad Hoc Committee during the 1970s reflected the prevailing international climate in general and the situation in the Indian Ocean region in particular. Since then the Committee's work has evolved considerably: it has mirrored shifting realities in the region as well as in the international political environment beyond it, including the tensions that had been engendered by the cold war and the rivalry that characterized the relationship between the great Powers.

In the last few years, following the end of the cold war, the rivalry between the great Powers has been replaced by a new and welcome phase of confidence, trust and cooperation. This has helped to create favourable opportunities to renew comprehensive global and regional efforts towards attaining the goals of peace, security and stability in the Indian Ocean region.

This favourable climate has been further enhanced by significant developments of a positive nature in the Indian Ocean region, including the establishment of a democratic, non-racial Government in South Africa and continuing encouraging developments in the Middle East.

Similarly, the entry into force in November 1994 of the Convention on the Law of the Sea will also help enhance prospects for mutually accommodative measures of cooperation, including the exercise of the freedom of the high seas, in accordance with the Convention.

The trend towards dialogue rather than confrontation that has manifested itself in these and other developments has also been clearly felt in the Ad Hoc Committee as it responds to emerging realities. All this has helped to give a fresh impetus to the pursuit of global and regional cooperation in the Indian Ocean region.

A new approach to the Ad Hoc Committee's work has been clearly evident in its deliberations over the last few years. An atmosphere free of rancour has prevailed, enabling a frank exchange of views. On the basis of the conclusions and recommendations of the Ad Hoc Committee's 1993 meetings, further consideration was given to new, alternative approaches to its work during its session this year.

94-86956 (E)

This record contains the original texts of speeches delivered in English and interpretations of speeches delivered in the other languages. Corrections should be submitted to original speeches only. They should be incorporated in a copy of the record and be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned to the Chief of the Verbatim Reporting Section, Room C-178. Corrections will be issued after the end of the session in a consolidated corrigendum.

The Ad Hoc Committee considered that measures of cooperation should be encouraged not only in respect of military but also of non-military aspects of security, keeping in view the various perceptions with regard to the region. It was also felt that confidence-building measures at various regional levels, building incrementally on cooperation among various regional and other partners, made an important contribution to the work of the Ad Hoc Committee. There was general recognition of the need to pursue both global and regional efforts in a complementary way, bearing in mind that the States of the region themselves could provide their own, specific, constructive contribution to strengthening peace, security, stability and cooperation in the Indian Ocean region. The Ad Hoc Committee also recognized the value of ongoing naval cooperation in the Indian Ocean, and encouraged consultations thereon between the countries concerned.

During this year's session, other innovative approaches were also proposed by individual member States. These are listed in the annex to the report, and were noted by the Committee after preliminary discussion.

It will be recalled that in 1989, three of the five permanent members of the Security Council that had been members of the Ad Hoc Committee withdrew from it. Others, including major maritime users, ceased to be active participants while none the less remaining members. It was therefore refreshing and encouraging to note, in 1993 and 1994, renewed interest and participation in the Ad Hoc Committee's work on the part of some of those States.

In these circumstances, the Ad Hoc Committee reiterates its conviction that the participation of all the permanent members of the Security Council, as well as that of major maritime users, in its work is important and that it would greatly facilitate the development of a mutually beneficial dialogue in the Indian Ocean region. Accordingly, the Ad Hoc Committee has requested its Chairman to apprise the Governments of the permanent members of the Security Council concerned, and the major maritime users, of the progress of work, and to consult with them in order to encourage their renewed participation and cooperation in it.

Based on the conclusions and recommendations of the Ad Hoc Committee, members of the Non-Aligned Movement have presented a draft resolution under this agenda item, contained in document A/C.1/49/L.37, submitted by Indonesia, the current Chairman of the Movement. I believe that the draft has been discussed also with some countries outside the Non-Aligned Movement. The draft has been carefully prepared to give articulation to the fresh approaches evident in the Ad Hoc Committee, and I am therefore pleased to commend it to the Committee for adoption without a vote.

Finally, on behalf of the Ad Hoc Committee, I should like to express our deep appreciation to Mr. Sohrab Kheradi, Senior Adviser to the Ad Hoc Committee, and to Mr. Timur Alasaniya, Secretary of the Ad Hoc Committee, for the excellent advice and support they gave.

The Chairman (*interpretation from Spanish*): I now call on the representative of Egypt who will introduce draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.16, entitled "Establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the region of the Middle East".

Mr. Elaraby (Egypt) (*interpretation from Arabic*): It gives me pleasure to present today the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/49/L.16, on the "Establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the region of the Middle East". This resolution has, over the past 20 years, traditionally been submitted at successive sessions of the General Assembly.

With the passage of time, this initiative has acquired broad support on both the international and the regional levels. It has without a doubt become a cornerstone of the efforts towards disarmament and arms control in the Middle East. It laid a basis for the principles of disarmament, and has contributed to the global trend towards curbing the proliferation of nuclear weapons.

The unprecedented developments that the Middle East region has witnessed since the peace process began in Madrid, and the outcome of the process, recent agreements between the Palestine Liberation Organization and Israel and between Jordan and Israel, bear witness to the fact that the Middle East has entered a new phase in relations between the States of the region. Now that all the parties have clearly demonstrated their readiness to take practical and specific steps to eliminate all causes of tension and conflict, and now that they have resolved to establish normal relations based on the principles of international law set out in the Charter, it is now legitimate to hope that the implementation of an initiative for the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone will be possible and that the initiative would strengthen the principle that there must be a just and comprehensive peace in the Middle East.

The positive atmosphere prevailing in the Middle East requires all of us — countries of the Middle East and all

other members of the international community — to work together to strengthen the peace process and its foundations so that more may be achieved, particularly with regard to disarmament, which will enable us to face challenges without clinging to obsolete theories.

All the countries of the Middle East have the right to their national security. It is inconceivable that any would compromise on anything that is fundamental to meeting that legitimate concern. We are confident that realizing that basic principle is indispensable for promoting success in the peace process and widening its framework. But we should reiterate in that regard the necessity to respect the principle of equality — the total equality of the States of the region — in particular with regard to their level of security. Any security imbalances would undoubtedly lead to a lack of trust and confidence and would undermine the credibility of the new situation.

No party should call for an arrangement that would mean its enjoying a special or exceptional status. Such calls would only undermine peace and throw the Middle East once again into the vicious circle of an arms race in a desperate attempt to deal with security imbalances.

The initiative to establish a nuclear-weapon-free zone, presented in the draft resolution, would guarantee balanced security in the Middle East. It would lay the foundation for the rights and obligations of the States of the region and would make a great contribution to strengthening the non-proliferation regime, which has become more important to the international community, as it promises a brighter future.

Communication channels and mechanisms, whether bilateral or multilateral, have become available to all Middle East States, and those States should use them to tackle all the basic security and stability issues in the region and to achieve the necessary, practical solutions to these issues. Foremost among them is the need to face up to the dangers of nuclear proliferation — in particular, through providing the necessary framework to implement the initiative as soon as possible.

There is no doubt that serious, timely handling of all the security factors in the region is the true way to guarantee tangible progress acceptable to all parties. Disregarding any factor in this very complex equation, or giving more weight to one factor over another, would be interpreted as an attempt to impose preconditions on the negotiating process, thus undermining the peace process.

I should not fail to mention in this regard the April 1990 initiative by President Mubarak on the establishment of a zone free of all weapons of mass destruction in the Middle East. That initiative was taken up in a Security Council resolution, and it is also mentioned in the present draft resolution. It has gained wide support.

There is an organic link between the two initiatives. They both have the same objective — the establishment of security and confidence — and they deal with the dangers of the proliferation of all three types of excessively dangerous weapons, in a manner commensurate with the danger posed by those weapons.

Implementing the initiative to establish a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East would be considered a major step giving momentum to the peace and reconciliation efforts in a new atmosphere of trust and confidence. It would also be in line with the global demand to enhance the Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) and implement its seventh article.

The draft resolution contains the usual basic elements that should be taken into account in order to eliminate the dangers of nuclear weapons in the Middle East. First, every country of the region should accede to the NPT. Secondly, all nuclear facilities in the Middle East should be subjected to the safeguards system of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA). Thirdly, all countries of the Middle East should cease to produce or possess such weapons or have them on their territories. Respect for these basic principles by all the countries of the Middle East and every country outside the region would be the main guarantee of the region's protection against the scourge of the arms race and would truly contribute to the globalization of the NPT.

In preparing the draft resolution we have paid great attention to preserving a balance, which has guaranteed consensus over the years. We have conducted in-depth consultations with many delegations in an atmosphere of cooperation. We have also demonstrated our willingness to include in the draft resolution all positive elements and ideas that would contribute to the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in a way that would guarantee consensus in the General Assembly, while reiterating the importance all members of the international community attach to this positive initiative.

The Chairman *(interpretation from Spanish)*: I have received requests from a number of delegations to extend the deadline — 6 p.m. today — for draft resolutions on international security agenda items 68 and 70. Although it

had been indicated that the deadline could not be extended, in view of those requests I wish to state, following consultations with a number of officers of the Committee, that it will be possible to extend the deadline until 6 p.m. on Wednesday, 9 November, if the Committee agrees. This is on the understanding that every effort will be made to arrive at draft resolutions that will really assist in bolstering understanding and cooperation between nations, and not widen differences, because this understanding and consolidation are a sound basis for strengthening peace and security in all regions.

If there is no objection, I will take it that the Committee agrees to the suggested extension.

It was so decided.

The Chairman (*interpretation from Spanish*): The next speaker is the representative of Mexico, who will introduce the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/49/L.25 concerning a step-by-step reduction of the nuclear threat.

Mr. Marín Bosch (Mexico) *(interpretation from Spanish):* Nuclear weapons made their fateful appearance on the international scene in the year that the United Nations was born. Although the United Nations Charter contains no reference to such weapons, they have been one of the major items on the United Nations agenda throughout its almost half-century of existence.

It should be recalled that in its first resolution, resolution 1 (I), the General Assembly considered this question. However, it was not possible at that time to halt the progressive development of nuclear arsenals, a process that has continued for five decades. Two thousand nuclear tests have been carried out, and nuclear weapons have continued to be improved and stockpiled. By the end of the 1980s there was already talk of the existence of more than 50,000 nuclear warheads. Meanwhile, the General Assembly went on adopting dozens of resolutions on a wide range of questions relating to such weapons of mass destruction and the dangers that they entail for all humanity.

More than three decades ago the General Assembly set itself the goal of general and complete disarmament under effective international control. In 1978, in the Final Document of its first special session devoted to disarmament, the General Assembly agreed, among other things, that

> "effective measures of nuclear disarmament and the prevention of nuclear war have the highest priority. To this end, it is imperative to remove the threat of nuclear weapons, to halt and reverse the nuclear arms race until the total elimination of nuclear weapons and their delivery systems has been achieved". *(resolution S-10/2, para. 20)*

Today we have the honour to introduce to the First Committee the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/49/L.25 on the subject of the step-by-step reduction of the nuclear threat. The draft is co-sponsored by the delegations of Brazil, Colombia, Egypt, India, Indonesia, Malaysia, Nigeria, Zimbabwe and Mexico.

The sponsors wish to place on record their appreciation for the contribution made by Parliamentarians for Global Action in developing the proposal and in the preparation of the draft resolution. We are particularly grateful for the efforts of Mr. Olafur Ragnar Grimsson, Chairman of the International Council, and Mr. Aaron Tovish, Deputy Secretary-General of the organization.

This is an extremely modest proposal on an issue of capital importance. The draft resolution is merely an attempt to offer the international community a mechanism that would allow all of us, but especially the nuclear-weapon States, to set out in an orderly and rational manner on the road to the gradual reduction of the nuclear threat.

The preamble to the draft resolution contains 12 paragraphs outlining the reasons why we think the proposal is timely. It begins and ends with a reference to the goal of the total elimination of nuclear weapons. It also identifies alternately some of the measures already taken in this post-cold-war era and the obstacles yet to be overcome with regard to nuclear weapons and the corresponding military doctrines. In short, it points out that the world is changing, and proposes a way to change it even more.

The preamble also stresses in its ninth paragraph the desire to

> "further current efforts regarding multilateral negotiations and agreements"

in the nuclear disarmament field. It identifies the Geneva Conference on Disarmament as the ideal forum for multilateral negotiations. Lastly, it expresses the conviction that agreement on a five-to-ten-year agenda on nuclear arms control would provide a needed, overall sense of direction to global disarmament efforts.

In order to facilitate this work, and by way of example, operative paragraph 1 identifies three general headings or areas, under each of which are listed the problems to be solved and the principal challenges to be met, as well as the steps required in order to do so.

Area A identifies steps to counter three specific activities: first, the acquisition and processing of special fissionable material for nuclear-weapon purposes; secondly, the manufacture and testing of nuclear warheads and their delivery vehicles; and, thirdly, the assembly and deployment of nuclear-weapon systems.

Then there is a list of means to achieve this: first, prohibiting the test explosion of nuclear weapons; secondly, cutting off the production of special fissile materials for weapons purposes; thirdly, ending production of nuclear warheads; fourthly, ending the production and testing of intermediate- and long-range ballistic missiles for nuclear-weapon purposes; fifthly, effective legally binding measures to deter the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons; and, sixthly, other related measures.

Area B refers to the steps to actuate, *inter alia*, first, the withdrawal from deployment and disassembly of nuclear-weapon systems; secondly, the secure storage and dismantlement of nuclear warheads and their delivery vehicles; and, thirdly, the elimination of special fissionable materials for nuclear-weapon purposes.

Here again, means to achieve this are indicated: first, standing down nuclear-weapon systems from high-alert status; secondly, separating nuclear warheads from their delivery vehicles; thirdly, placing nuclear warheads in secure storage; fourthly, converting delivery vehicles, where appropriate, to peaceful uses; fifthly, removing special nuclear materials from warheads; sixthly, converting special nuclear materials to non-weapon purposes; and, seventhly, other related measures.

Area C covers steps to prepare, under international auspices, first, an inventory of the nuclear arsenals, including all special fissile materials, nuclear warheads and their delivery vehicles, as well as all facilities devoted to the processing, manufacture, assembly and deployment of those items; secondly, a reorientation of those facilities necessary to the task of implementing measures relating to area B; and, lastly, the closure or conversion to peaceful purposes of all other such facilities in furtherance of measures relating to area A.

Consequently, in operative paragraph 2 of the draft resolution the Assembly asks Member States, in particular the nuclear-weapon States,

> "to consider steps which they might take unilaterally, bilaterally, or in cooperation with other States to promote progress in the identified areas, and fully to inform the international community of any steps taken in this regard".

In operative paragraph 3 of draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.25 it is recommended that in 1995 the Conference on Disarmament do two things. First, it should develop, on the basis of the three general areas mentioned in operative paragraph 1,

> "a comprehensive set of practical, verifiable measures for possible negotiation in their next five- and ten-year periods".

Secondly, it should determine, on the basis of that set of measures and with due regard to the measures taken pursuant to operative paragraph 2,

> "a year-by-year sequence and combination of negotiations on specific measures to be commenced during the next five- and ten-year periods".

Finally, draft resolution A/49/C.1/L.25 requests the Conference on Disarmament to include in its 1995 report to the General Assembly a section on efforts undertaken in accordance with the foregoing.

The sponsors are well aware that the Conference on Disarmament is considering several important disarmament items, especially the one concerning a comprehensive nuclear-test ban. But we are convinced that what is proposed in draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.25 does not exceed the working capacity of the Conference on Disarmament. Furthermore, we consider that we are contributing to the good functioning of that sole multilateral disarmament negotiating forum by offering a path that, as indicated in the preambular part of the draft resolution, will lead to a step-by-step reduction of the nuclear threat and will thus lead us towards the goal of eliminating nuclear weapons from national arsenals.

In this respect, it should be stressed that no one is trying to impose on anyone a preconceived nuclear-disarmament programme. This is, rather, an invitation to examine jointly one of the priority agenda items of both the General Assembly and the Conference on Disarmament.

The Chairman (*interpretation from Spanish*): I now call on the representative of Japan, who will introduce draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.33, "Nuclear disarmament with a view to the ultimate elimination of nuclear weapons".

Mr. Tanaka (Japan): I wish to introduce the draft resolution entitled "Nuclear disarmament with a view to the ultimate elimination of nuclear weapons", contained in document A/C.1/49/L.33.

Japan, which sincerely desires that tragedies involving the use of nuclear weapons should never be repeated, has been emphasizing the need for the realistic and steady promotion of nuclear disarmament with a view to the ultimate objective of eliminating nuclear weapons. Such remarkable developments as the agreement on nuclear arms reductions between the United States and the Russian Federation, progress in comprehensive test-ban treaty negotiations and last year's adoption by the General Assembly of the resolution on the negotiation of the prohibition of the production of fissile material for explosive purposes have contributed to the favourable trend towards nuclear disarmament now prevailing. Next year an important decision will be made on the extension of the Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT), which is now adhered to by as many as 165 countries, including all nuclear-weapon States, and which has indeed played a major role in nuclear non-proliferation and nuclear disarmament.

Under these circumstances, Japan considers it very important that the nuclear-weapon States continue to promote nuclear disarmament, underpinned by the strengthening of the NPT regime. In order to reflect these views in a document expressing the determination of the international community, Japan decided to submit this draft resolution. We are ready to engage in consultations on it, and we hope that it will be supported by all States.

The Chairman (*interpretation from Spanish*): I now call on the representative of Nigeria, who will introduce the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/49/L.28, entitled "1995 Review and Extension Conference of States Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons".

Mr. Ayewah (Nigeria): I have the honour to introduce, on behalf of Indonesia, Mexico, Namibia, Nigeria, Zambia and Zimbabwe, the draft resolution entitled "1995 Review and Extension Conference of States Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons", contained in document A/C.1/49/L.28.

The task of consolidating the 1968 Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) goes beyond the purview of a forum limited to the States parties to the Treaty. The Treaty has an important role to play in the international disarmament agenda and in the maintenance of international peace and security. It was in recognition of this fact that the General Assembly commended the Treaty to Member States in resolution 2373 (XXII), adopted on 12 June 1968. We believe that no effort should be spared in consolidating the NPT or in encouraging the widest possible adherence to it. Our quest is for universal adherence. Fortunately, the Treaty is coming up for consideration at a time when the cold war has become history, and the way can now be paved for further progress in nuclear disarmament, as was envisaged during the negotiations on the Treaty a quarter of a century ago.

However, we fear that, if care is not taken, the various opposing interpretations of the extension provision in article X, paragraph 2, of the Treaty advanced recently could derail the process of extending the Treaty in 1995. We are convinced that the international community, as represented in the General Assembly, must forestall this confusion in order to prevent interminable legal arguments during the 1995 Review and Extension Conference.

The draft resolution therefore calls for action that will make clear the thinking of States parties well ahead of the Conference and help them focus on the most acceptable approach to the extension of the Treaty. We hope, too, that the draft resolution will generate discussion of the various options and actions to be taken, as well as debate on substantive steps towards fulfilment of the provisions of the preamble and the various articles of the Treaty — especially article VI, which concerns nuclear disarmament.

A number of actions are possible under paragraph 2 of article X of the non-proliferation Treaty. States parties need to put forward their ideas and legal interpretations of the article in order that a flexible approach may be adopted when the decision on extending the Treaty is taken.

In its operative paragraphs, the draft resolution calls upon States parties to give appropriate consideration to the import of the Treaty in its entirety and, on that basis, to give special attention to the extension provision. Thereafter, it invites States parties to provide their legal interpretations of article X, paragraph 2, and their views on the different options and myriad actions that are possible in extending and consolidating the Treaty.

In accordance with resolution 47/52 A of 9 December 1992, which requested the Secretary-General to render the necessary assistance for the 1995 Conference and its Preparatory Committee, and in view of the important role of the NPT in international disarmament efforts, this draft resolution requests the Secretary-General to compile the legal interpretations and views submitted by States parties in the form of a background document for the 1995 Conference. This document is to be made available well before the holding of that Conference.

We believe that this action will greatly facilitate consideration of the issues — at the fourth session of the Preparatory Committee, if possible, and certainly at the Review and Extension Conference. We hope that all States parties — nuclear and non-nuclear, industrial and developing — will take advantage of this draft resolution to present their views.

The Chairman *(interpretation from Spanish):* The next speaker is the representative of Cameroon, who will introduce draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.20, which is entitled "Regional confidence-building measures".

Mr. Bilao Tang (Cameroon) *(interpretation from French):* I should like first to express my delegation's condolences to the Egyptian Government and people, who have our complete sympathy.

Debates in the General Assembly and in this Committee have given us an opportunity to recall and deplore the many crises and hotbeds of tension that absorb the meagre basic resources of this Organization, to the detriment of development activities; to emphasize that the African continent is among the hardest hit by crises and hotbeds of tension; and finally to hail the leading role of preventive diplomacy, which must be encouraged and supported by the entire international community. Regional disarmament and the promotion of confidence-building measures have been highlighted in this regard.

While, some countries in central Africa are experiencing relative peace, without being totally free from threats of destabilization, Rwanda, Burundi and, until recently, Angola have reminded us that central Africa is definitely in the zone of turbulence, conflict and tension, which is shaking the African continent.

It is in this context that we have the Standing Advisory Committee on Security Questions in Central Africa, set up on 28 May 1992 by the Secretary-General under resolution 46/37 B of 6 December 1991. This was an initiative taken by 11 States of central Africa to promote confidence-building measures, disarmament and development in the subregion, which should be a zone of peace and security for all Member States.

As is clear from the Secretary-General's report (A/49/546), the 11 States of the Committee have made considerable progress in implementing confidence-building measures in the subregion. The Non-Aggression Pact between States members, concluded in Libreville, Gabon, in 1993, was initialled during the fifth ministerial meeting of the Committee, which was held in Yaoundé in September 1994. This Pact will be submitted for signature by the Heads of State during the summit to take place in Cameroon next December, and it will enter into force before the end of the year.

Furthermore, the States of central Africa have undertaken to participate henceforth in peace-keeping operations within the framework of the United Nations and the Organization of African Unity, and, to that end, to set up within their respective armed forces specialist peace-keeping units. All these units will constitute reserve forces, at the disposal of the United Nations Secretary-General for immediate deployment for peace-keeping and humanitarian-assistance operations.

In submitting this draft resolution on regional confidence-building measures on behalf of the States members of the Standing Advisory Committee on Security Questions in Central Africa — Angola, Burundi, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, Congo, Equatorial Guinea, Gabon, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, and Zaire — I recall that the Committee's activities come within the sphere of preventive diplomacy and therefore deserve the encouragement of our Organization and the international community.

It goes without saying that investment in peace is much less costly than investment in peace-keeping or in the restoration or consolidation of peace. Consequently the 11 States members of the Standing Advisory Committee would like the United Nations, as well as interested bodies and States, to help them to promote confidence-building measures in the subregion — in particular, through various types of support, including assistance with the training and preparation of specialist peace-keeping units within their respective armed forces.

We hope, therefore, that this draft resolution, whose subject is one of the Committee's major concerns, will be

adopted by consensus, as it would not involve additional finance.

The Chairman *(interpretation from Spanish)*: The next speaker is the representative of Brazil, who will introduce draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.39, entitled "The South Atlantic region as a nuclear-weapon-free zone".

Mr. Valle (Brazil): I have the honour to introduce the draft resolution entitled "The South Atlantic region as a nuclear-weapon-free zone" (A/C.1/49/L.39), under agenda items 71 and 72. The draft resolution is sponsored by the Member States of the Zone of Peace and Cooperation of the South Atlantic and by a number of other delegations.

One of the most important objectives to be pursued within the framework of the Zone of Peace and Cooperation is the denuclearization of the South Atlantic. We are determined to ensure the achievement of the ultimate goal of eliminating the risk and threat of nuclear weapons from the South Atlantic region once and for all.

In this respect, a number of initiatives have been advanced, beginning with the 1964 Declaration of the Organization of African Unity and the 1967 Treaty of Tlatelolco, initiatives designed to promote the realization of a nuclear-weapon-free zone.

In Africa, considerable progress has been made in drafting a treaty on the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone. In Latin America and the Caribbean, important steps have been taken to bring the Treaty of Tlatelolco fully into force for all countries of the region. In this connection, at the third meeting of the States of the Zone of Peace and Cooperation of the South Atlantic, held in Brasilia last September, delegations unanimously adopted a Declaration on the denuclearization of the South Atlantic.

In order to build on the successful cooperation between nations in the South Atlantic, the members of the Zone, with the support of a number of delegations, commend to the First Committee the draft resolution before us in the sincere hope that it can be adopted by consensus.

The Chairman (*interpretation from Spanish*): The next speaker is the representative of Mexico, who will introduce draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.8, "United Nations Disarmament Information Programme."

Mr. Abarca (Mexico)(*interpretation from Spanish*): I should like to introduce for the consideration of the First Committee draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.8 on agenda item 63 (d), "United Nations Disarmament Information Programme."

Since 1982 Mexico has been introducing the proposal on the United Nations Disarmament Information Programme, formerly known as the World Disarmament Campaign. Financial contributions to the Programme have not thus far met the target set 13 years ago. In 1994 only 22 countries were net contributors. This number is disheartening if we take into account the fact that the United Nations community is now comprised of 184 countries.

My delegation finds it disturbing that, although the request of a number of countries to change the title of the Programme was agreed to, two years after that change was made there has still been no substantial increase in the level of contributions. We recognize that the number of contributor countries has risen from 13 in 1993 to 22 in 1994, but the total funds received fell from $745,000 to $654,000, a decrease of more than 12 per cent. The geographical breakdown of contributors also indicates that much still remains to be done.

This is particularly serious at a time when the Programme has been recognized as the only global instrument by which objective data can be made available to all regions of the world. It should be noted that the objective of this initiative remains valid; it continues to be:

> "the widest possible dissemination of information and unimpeded access for all sectors of the public to a broad range of information and opinions on questions of arms limitation and disarmament and on the dangers relating to all aspects of the arms race and war, in particular nuclear war". *(resolution 37/100 H, third preambular paragraph)*

Another matter to be considered is the proposal to consider the item on a biennial basis as a way to help lighten the workload of the First Committee. If adopted, that proposal would mean that the annual Pledging Conference would remain the sole instrument for fostering increased financial contributions. None the less, we hope that the number of contributors will continue to rise.

It is on behalf of the delegations of Bolivia, Costa Rica, Honduras, Indonesia, Islamic Republic of Iran, Myanmar, Nicaragua, Sri Lanka, Ukraine, Venezuela and Mexico, that I have the honour to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.8, entitled "United Nations Disarmament

Information Programme", for consideration by the First Committee.

In its preambular paragraphs the draft resolution refers to the report (A/49/371) of the Secretary-General of 9 September 1994 on the United Nations Disarmament Information Programme and the to the Final Act of the Twelfth United Nations Pledging Conference for the Programme, held on 28 October 1994.

In the operative paragraphs the Secretary-General is commended for his efforts to make effective use of the resources available. The draft resolution notes with appreciation the contributions made by information centres and regional centres for disarmament. Paragraph 4 recommends that the Programme should further focus its efforts to inform, educate and generate public understanding of the importance of and support for multilateral action in the disarmament area, and that it work more closely with various organs of the public and non-governmental sectors in facilitating exchange of information on ideas. To this end, the draft resolution recommends the organization of meetings to facilitate exchanges of views and information on disarmament issues.

In addition, all Member States are invited to contribute to the Voluntary Trust Fund for the United Nations Disarmament Information Programme.

Lastly, the draft resolution commends the Secretary-General for supporting the efforts of universities, other academic institutions and non-governmental organizations active in the educational field in widening the world-wide availability of disarmament education, and requests him to submit to the General Assembly at its fifty-first session a report covering both the implementation of the activities of the Programme and the activities contemplated for the following two years.

The sponsors of draft resolution L.8 trust that the First Committee will adopt it without a vote.

The Chairman (*interpretation from Spanish*): I now call upon the representative of India, who will introduce draft resolutions A/C.1/49/L.31, "Convention on the Prohibition of the Use of Nuclear Weapons", and L.32, "Scientific and technological developments and their impact on international security."

Mr. Chandra (India): I should like to avail myself of this opportunity to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.31, "Convention on the Prohibition of the Use of Nuclear Weapons", and L.32, "Scientific and technological developments and their impact on international security."

In introducing the draft resolution on the Convention on the Prohibition of the Use of Nuclear Weapons, let me begin by saying that the international political-military scene has been marked by many positive developments in the past few years, such as the end of the cold war; the START II agreement and the recent understanding to implement it in an accelerated mode; the unilateral decisions to dismantle portions of awesome nuclear arsenals; the conclusion of the chemical weapons Convention; and the commencement of negotiations on a comprehensive test-ban treaty.

Welcome as those developments are, the fact remains that the nuclear-weapon States still hold enough nuclear weapons to destroy all life on our planet several times over. The threat of instant incineration in a nuclear holocaust will continue to haunt us until we achieve the complete elimination of nuclear weapons through a universal, multilaterally negotiated and effectively verifiable treaty.

Pending the emergence of a nuclear-weapon-free world through such a treaty — which will, we recognize, be some time in coming — we can greatly minimize the possibility of a nuclear war and reduce the incentive for horizontal proliferation by concluding a convention on the prohibition of the use and threat of use of nuclear weapons.

We are not persuaded by the argument, which some might endeavour to make, that our proposals have become unnecessary on account of the improved political climate. The existence of mankind is much too serious a matter to be left hostage to the vicissitudes of the international political climate. Prudence demands that, pending the complete elimination of nuclear weapons, we act with urgency, taking advantage of the prevailing favourable situation to develop a norm against the use of such weapons. A convention on the prohibition of the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons, as called for by us in draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.31, would establish such a norm and would also provide the security assurances demanded for so long by the non-nuclear-weapon States.

It is in this spirit and against this background that my delegation introduces draft resolution L.31, entitled "Convention on the prohibition of the Use of Nuclear Weapons". It is sponsored by 18 countries: Bangladesh, Bhutan, Bolivia, Colombia, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Honduras, Indonesia,

Lao People's Democratic Republic, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mexico, Myanmar, Sudan, Viet Nam and India.

The draft resolution underlines that the use of nuclear weapons poses the most serious threat to the survival of mankind; welcomes the nuclear disarmament measures recently initiated by the United States of America and the Russian Federation; notes that a multilateral agreement prohibiting the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons would strengthen international security and help promote a climate for negotiations leading to the ultimate elimination of nuclear weapons; and reiterates its request to the Conference on Disarmament to commence negotiations on a priority basis to reach agreement on an international convention prohibiting the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons under any circumstances, taking as a possible basis the annexed draft convention.

We would like to take this opportunity to thank all our co-sponsors for the cooperation extended to us and to urge all Member States to help further ameliorate the international security climate by supporting this draft resolution.

Our draft resolution — A/C.1/49/L.32 — on scientific and technological developments and their impact on international security is sponsored by the delegations of Bhutan, Bolivia, Colombia, Honduras, Indonesia, Nepal, Nigeria and Sri Lanka, in addition to India. It focuses on the qualitative aspect of disarmament, which was ignored until a few years ago. At the third special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, in 1988, India voiced its concerns in this regard. Resolution 43/77 A, adopted with wide support, requested the Secretary-General's report, contained in document A/45/568, bore out our concerns by indicating that in some respects modern technological advances might be hindering rather than helping the pursuit of international security. The report identified five broad areas in which to follow scientific and technological developments: nuclear technology, space technology, materials technology, information technology and biotechnology. Taking into account the illustrative set of criteria it elaborated, this report suggested that the international community needed to be better equipped to follow the nature and direction of technological change, and that the United Nations could serve as a catalyst and a clearinghouse in this regard.

Our draft resolution builds upon the Secretary-General's report. While welcoming his most recent report (A/49/502) and agreeing with his assessment that the application of new technologies for a qualitative improvement of weapons systems is harmful to the cause of disarmament, it requests him to follow scientific and technological developments, make an assessment in keeping with the criteria he has developed and submit a report thereon to the fiftieth session of the General Assembly. It further requests him to develop a database of concerned research institutions and experts with a view to promoting transparency and international cooperation in the applications of scientific and technological developments for pursuing disarmament objectives such as disposal of weapons, conversion and verification.

We regret that it has not been possible for us to have a single draft resolution on this subject; we feel regret because, while the draft resolution fielded by us in the form of L.32 clearly brings out the Jekyll-and-Hyde nature of science and technology and outlines a methodology to curb its adverse impact, draft resolution L.29 tends to blur the negative impact of science and technology on international security and disarmament. This was also a factor which made it difficult to evolve a consensus in the Disarmament Commission on this matter.

We are confident that a shared awareness of technological advances and their channelization to peaceful purposes will create a happier world and a safer security environment. It is obvious that in an interdependent world we have a common future and must therefore demonstrate a common determination to give science and technology a human face. The challenges of eradicating poverty and its attendant social problems, the problems of global warming, ozone depletion and environment management, verification, conversion and safe weapons disposal, all of which have acquired a global dimension, require our inventiveness and cooperation on a global basis. Scientific and technological advance must of course be pursued, but it should be oriented towards peaceful uses for the sustainable benefit of mankind.

My delegation and the others on whose behalf we have introduced this draft resolution sincerely hope that it will receive the Committee's fullest support.

The Chairman (*interpretation from Spanish*): I call on Mr. Sirous Nasseri of the Islamic Republic of Iran to introduce, in his capacity as President of the Conference on Disarmament, the report of the Conference, contained in document A/49/27.

Mr. Nasseri (Islamic Republic of Iran), President of the Conference on Disarmament: Before presenting the annual report of the Conference for 1994, I wish, Sir, to

congratulate you on your election as the Chairman of the First Committee, and to congratulate the other officers of the Committee.

For the last four decades the international community has aspired to a world free of weapons of mass destruction and to the reduction of armaments to a minimum level for defensive purposes. Those aspirations are expected to become reality now that the frustrating era of the cold war is behind us. Disarmament is indeed a fundamental pillar of the new international relations and cooperation.

As the sole multilateral negotiating body for disarmament, the Conference on Disarmament shoulders a major responsibility for meeting the challenges and expectations of the present day. Its rich experience in such negotiations is a valuable asset in producing international agreements on various aspects of disarmament and seizing opportunities that have emerged. The result of its work, though not prolific, can still be considered significant given the sophisticated nature of disarmament negotiations.

The Conference on Disarmament adopted an agenda for the 1994 session which included eight items related to several facets of disarmament, omitting the issue of chemical weapons, since the Convention has now entered its preparatory phase at The Hague following its successful conclusion in 1992. It also had before it 13 resolutions adopted at the forty-eighth session of the General Assembly, which had addressed specific requests to the Conference on Disarmament.

However, without prejudice to its future decision on the organizational framework of other items, the Conference concentrated its work on negotiations for a comprehensive nuclear test-ban treaty, the prevention of an arms race in outer space, effective international arrangements to assure non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons, and transparency in armaments through the establishment of ad hoc committees. For other items, the Conference did not establish ad hoc committees, although they were addressed by the delegations in various forms and their positions have been reflected in official documents and working papers as well as the plenary records of the Conference.

The Conference at its 1994 session gave special priority to the comprehensive test-ban treaty, and every effort was made to make this first year of negotiations a productive one and to present a promising report to the General Assembly. I am pleased to say that the result is to a large extent encouraging. This is particularly true in the light of the expressed willingness and enthusiasm of delegations to bring these negotiations to a successful conclusion as soon as possible. The Conference has decided to continue its work on the treaty through an inter-sessional period, which will commence immediately following this session of the First Committee. Unswerving support by the General Assembly this year will again buttress the negotiations; just as last year the consensus resolution here served as the underpinning for the work in the Conference.

During 1994, nearly 150 working papers were submitted to the Ad Hoc Committee on a Nuclear Test Ban regarding different aspects of the treaty. The Ad Hoc Committee decided to include the results of its ongoing negotiations in a rolling text. Its first part represents the present stage of the elaboration of the provisions of the draft treaty which command a certain degree of consensus, whereas the second part contains provisions which need more extensive negotiations. The rolling text provides a good basis for further negotiations, which of course will also include some political decisions on certain issues.

The Ad Hoc Committee on Outer Space carried out substantive work on legal and terminological issues and on confidence-building measures. The question of terminological issues was considered important even though it was generally held that the completion of work on terminology was not a *conditio sine qua non* for negotiating new instruments or measures for the prevention of an arms race in outer space.

As regards confidence-building measures, the scope of the exchange of information and notifications, as well as their time-frame, was discussed. The establishment of an international outer-space monitoring system and a communication network was also addressed. In addition, notifications for space objects with nuclear-power sources and assessment of compliance as part of the confidence-building measures regime were examined.

On negative security assurances, the Ad Hoc Committee reaffirmed that, pending the effective elimination of nuclear weapons, non-nuclear-weapon States should be effectively assured by the nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons. There was a general feeling that there was a need to concentrate on the question of security assurances related to nuclear weapons, while an eventual solution on the issue of negative security assurances might also involve addressing the problem of positive assurances, building on the principles contained in Security Council resolution 255 (1968).

The Conference held substantive discussions this year on transparency in armaments. It addressed the overall aspects of the issue: military holdings and procurement through national production; the transfer of high technology with military applications; and weapons of mass destruction. It also examined other interrelated aspects of transparency in armaments and elaborated upon universal and non-discriminatory practical means to increase openness and transparency. This included massive production of sophisticated advanced armaments; excessive and destabilizing accumulation of arms; a code of conduct; and regional approaches. It was recognized that the establishment of the United Nations Register of Conventional Arms constituted a step forward in the promotion of transparency in military matters, and that it needed to be further improved and developed in such a manner as to encourage universal participation.

Consultations were held on the most appropriate arrangement to negotiate a treaty on fissile materials. There was consensus among members that the Conference was the appropriate forum to negotiate a treaty on the issue. While there was no agreement on a mandate for an ad hoc committee, there was agreement in principle that an ad hoc committee should be established as soon as a mandate had been agreed. The Conference decided to continue consultations on this matter.

There were also consultations on the issue of the review of the Conference's agenda, which will be continued during the next annual session. At the same time, some decisions were made on the improved and effective functioning of the Conference. In relation to the expansion of its membership, however, despite intensive efforts to arrive at an agreed solution, it was, regrettably, not possible to move beyond the situation in 1993. The Conference will continue to address the question of its expansion and will make every effort to reach a solution by the beginning of its 1995 session.

Looking ahead to its next annual session, the Conference recognizes a number of urgent and important issues for negotiation which would draw heavily on its time and resources. The balance of its future work will be considered more fully, therefore, in deciding which ad hoc committee, besides the Ad Hoc Committee on a Nuclear Test Ban, should be established in 1995.

As the President of the Conference on Disarmament, I take this opportunity to thank warmly the Secretary-General of the Conference, Mr. Vladimir Petrovsky, and the Deputy Secretary-General of the Conference, Mr. Abdelkader Bensmail, as well as their able secretariat, for the valuable, solid and continuous assistance they have provided to the Conference during the 1994 session.

The Chairman (*interpretation from Spanish*): I now call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Kheradi (Secretary of the Committee): I would like to inform the Committee that the following countries have become sponsors of the following draft resolutions: A/C.1/49/L.9/Rev.1, Bahamas, Senegal and the Philippines; A/C.1/49/L.13, the Republic of Moldova, Argentina and Spain; A/C.1/49/L.18, Cameroon; A/C.1/49/L.19, Mongolia and India; A/C.1/49/L.21, Cameroon, the Republic of Moldova and Argentina; A/C.1/49/L.22, Brunei Darussalam, Guatemala, Nepal, the Republic of Moldova and the Philippines; A/C.1/49/L.23, Guatemala and the Republic of Moldova; A/C.1/49/L.26, Guatemala and Suriname; A/C.1/49/L.29, Nepal and the Republic of Moldova; A/C.1/49/L.30, Senegal; A/C.1/49/L.39, Congo, Guinea and Venezuela; A/C.1/49/L.42, Bolivia and the Republic of Moldova; and A/C.1/49/L.44, Greece and Norway.

The meeting rose at 4.50 p.m.